

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 14 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended.

Claims 1 through 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps. In particular, the above Office Action states that synchronization can only be achieved if the highest latency is determined. In response, Applicant has added a reference to a longest link latency to the claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 1 through 14 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 5 and 8 through 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,907,677 to Glenn, et al. ("Glenn, et al. patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,193,151 to Jain ("Jain patent") and U.S. Patent No. 6,715,005 to Rodriguez, et al. ("Rodriguez, et al. patent"). Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Glenn, et al. patent in view of the Jain patent, the Rodriguez, et al. patent, and U.S. Patent No. 6,587,450 to Pasanen ("Pasanen patent"). Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Glenn, et al. patent in view of the Jain patent, the Rodriguez, et al. patent, and U.S. Patent No. 5,712,587 to Schauder, et al. ("Schauder, et al. patent").

Independent claim 1 as amended provides, *inter alia*, designating a particular client device with the longest link latency among the client devices as a pacer participant for an ongoing chat session, and adjusting transmission timing of chat messages to each client device,

except for the pacer participant, based on the link latency, thereby synchronizing reception of each chat message at the client devices based on said link latency. Independent claim 8 as amended provides, *inter alia*, a chat server that determines a link latency associated with communicating a message with the wireless device(s), and adjusts transmission timing of chat messages to each client device, except for a pacer participant with the longest link latency, based on the link latency, thereby synchronizing reception of each chat message at the client devices based on said link latency. Support for the above added recitation is provided at page 14, lines 6 through 23, of the specification.

The above Office Action states, at page 4, lines 8 through 10, that the Glenn, et al. patent and the Jain patent do not teach adjusting transmission timing of messages to synchronize reception of each chat message at the plurality of client devices based on link latency. However, the above Office Action continues by stating, at page 4, lines 11 through 13, that the Rodriguez, et al. patent teaches this element. The Rodriguez, et al. patent describes a system for reducing latency in message passing systems. On the other hand, the Rodriguez, et al. patent does not describe any type of adjustment of transmission timing of chat messages to each client device based on link latency that excludes a pacer participant with the longest link latency, as required by amended claims 1 and 8. Likewise, the Glenn, et al. patent, the Jain patent, the Pasanen patent, and the Schauder, et al. patent do not describe or suggest adjusting transmission timing of chat messages to each client device based on link latency that excludes a pacer participant with the longest link latency, as required by amended claims 1 and 8. Therefore, amended claims 1 and 8 distinguish patentably from the Glenn, et al. patent, the Jain patent, the Rodriguez, et al. patent, the Pasanen patent, Schauder, et al. patent, and any combination of these patents.

Claims 2 through 7 and 9 through 14 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 1 and 8 as amended. Therefore claims 2 through 7 and 9 through 14 distinguish patentably from the Glenn, et al. patent, the Jain patent, the Rodriguez, et al. patent, the Pasanen patent, the Schauder, et al. patent, and any combination of these patents for the reasons stated above for amended claims 1 and 8.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 14 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Phillips, W. Garland

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45, AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048

<u>/HISASHI D. WATANABE/</u>	<u>06/29/06</u>
Hisashi D. Watanabe	Date
Attorney for Applicant(s)	
Registration No. 37,465	
Telephone: (847) 523-2322	
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350	